



Canopy and Litter Ant Assemblages Share Similar Climate-Species Density Relations

Citation

Weiser, Michael D., Nathan J. Sanders, Donat Agosti, Alan N. Anderson, Aaron M. Ellison, Brian L. Fisher, Heloise Gibb, et al. 2010. *Biology Letters* 6(6): 769-772.

Published Version

doi:10.1098/rsbl.2010.0151

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:4677616>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Open Access Policy Articles, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#OAP>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

Canopy and litter ant assemblages share similar climate-species density relationships.

Michael D. Weiser^{1,*}, Nathan J. Sanders², Donat Agosti³, Alan N. Andersen⁴, Aaron M. Ellison⁵, Brian L. Fisher⁶, Heloise Gibb⁷, Nicholas J. Gotelli⁸, Aaron D. Gove⁹, Kevin Gross¹⁰, Benoit Guénard¹, Milan Janda¹¹, Michael Kaspari¹², Jean-Philippe Lessard², John T. Longino¹³, Jonathan D. Majer⁹, Sean B. Menke¹, Terrence P. McGlynn¹⁴, Catherine L. Parr¹⁵, Stacy M. Philpott¹⁶, Javier Retana¹⁷, Andrew V. Suarez¹⁸, Heraldo L. Vasconcelos¹⁹, Stephen P. Yanoviak²⁰ and Robert R. Dunn¹

¹Department of Biology, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695, USA.

²Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996, USA.

³Swiss Residence, Ave Khazar 21, 19649 Teheran, Iran

⁴CSIRO Tropical Ecosystems Research Centre, Winnellie, NT 0822, Australia

⁵Harvard Forest, Harvard University, Petersham, MA 01366, USA.

⁶Department of Entomology, California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, CA 94118, USA

⁷Department of Zoology, La Trobe University, Bundoora 3086, Victoria, Australia.

⁸Department of Biology, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT 05405, USA

⁹Centre for Ecosystem Diversity and Dynamics, Department of Environmental and Aquatic Sciences, Curtin University, Perth, WA 6845 Australia.

¹⁰Department of Statistics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695, USA

¹¹Biology Center, Czech Academy of Sciences and Faculty of Science, University of South Bohemia, 370 05 Ceske Budejovice, Czech Republic.

¹²Department of Zoology, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 73019, USA.

¹³The Evergreen State College, Olympia, WA 98505, USA.

¹⁴Department of Biology, California State University Dominguez Hills, Carson, CA 90747, USA.

¹⁵Environmental Change Institute, Oxford University Centre for the Environment, Oxford OX13QY, UK

¹⁶Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Toledo, Toledo, OH 43606, USA

¹⁷Estación Biológica de Doñana, CSIC, E-41013 Sevilla, Spain.

¹⁸Departments of Entomology and Animal Biology, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

¹⁹Institute of Biology, Federal University of Uberlândia (UFU), CP 593, 38400-902, Uberlândia, MG, Brazil.

²⁰Department of Biology, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Little Rock, AR 72204 USA.

36

37 SUMMARY

38 Tropical forest canopies house most of the globe's diversity, yet little is known about global patterns and
39 drivers of canopy diversity. Here we present models of ant species density, using climate, abundance
40 and habitat (i.e., canopy v. litter) as predictors. Ant species density is positively associated with
41 temperature and precipitation, and negatively (or non-significantly) associated with two metrics of
42 seasonality, precipitation seasonality and temperature range. Ant species density was significantly
43 higher in canopy samples, but this difference disappeared once abundance was considered. Thus, the
44 apparent differences in species density between canopy and litter samples are likely due to differences
45 in abundance-diversity relationships, not differences in climate-diversity relationships. Thus it appears
46 that canopy and litter ant assemblages share a common abundance-diversity relationship influenced by
47 similar but not identical climatic drivers.

48

49 KEYWORDS: Formicidae, species richness, global diversity gradients

1. INTRODUCTION

Tropical forest canopies may house more than half of the world's animal species (Erwin 1982; Stork 1993; Ødegaard 2000; Novotny *et al.* 2002), but little is known about how canopy diversity varies at global scales (but see Majer *et al.* 2001; Kitching *et al.* 1993). If the patterns and the climatic correlates of canopy diversity are different from ground-dwelling taxa, current models (which are largely based on ground-dwelling taxa) may not apply for a striking majority of Earth's biodiversity. Alternatively, if similar factors drive canopy and ground-dwelling species diversity, then understanding the factors that shape the diversity of ground-dwelling taxa will be useful for understanding canopy diversity as well.

Ants can comprise more than half of the arthropod abundance and biomass of tropical forest canopies (e.g., Fittkau and Klinge 1973; Floren & Linsenmair 1997; Tobin 1995; Davidson 2003). It is clear that climate is correlated with ant diversity, with the combination of temperature and precipitation often representing the best two climatic predictors for the diversity of litter-dwelling ants (Kaspari, *et al.* 2004; Sanders, *et al.* 2007; Dunn, *et al.* 2009). However, different factors may limit the diversity of litter and canopy ants. Canopy ants tend to feed at lower trophic levels than litter ants (Yanoviak & Kaspari 2000; Blüthgen *et al.* 2003; Davidson *et al.* 2007) and therefore may depend more directly on plant production. As plant productivity is highest in warm, wet and aseasonal environments (e.g., Schuur 2003), canopy ant diversity may be more strongly associated with precipitation and temperature than litter ant diversity. Additionally, if canopy ants maintain large colony sizes relative to litter ants (Davidson, 2007), then a given number of workers may be distributed among fewer canopy species, leading to different abundance-diversity relationships. Finally, canopy ants potentially face greater exposure to climatic variability (e.g., Hood and Tschinkel, 1990) than litter ants, which may lead to greater dependence of canopy diversity on climatic seasonality.

Here we generate models of ant species density (i.e., S =the number of species in a sample; Gotelli and Colwell, 2001) that use climate, abundance and stratum (i.e., 23 canopy v. 192 litter collections) to understand how and how well these variables predict ant species density.

2. Data

We compiled data on canopy ant species density from the literature using studies that sampled arboreal assemblages by canopy fogging. Fogging studies attempt to sample only ants present in the canopy, but this does not necessarily exclude ground-nesting, canopy-foraging species. We recorded species density (S), and abundance (N = the number of individual ants), and for studies that did not differentiate spatially between locations, we used the mean of each variable. Twenty-three localities met the above criteria (see Table S1). To compare canopy patterns with better-understood patterns of litter ants (e.g., Kaspari *et al.*, 2000, 2004; Sanders, *et al.* 2007, Dunn *et al.* 2009), we extracted similar data from 192 litter samples (i.e., the subset of Winkler extractions from forested areas from Dunn *et al.* 2009 that reported abundance, see Table S2). For each location, we extracted mean annual temperature, annual precipitation (hereafter, “temperature” and “precipitation”), annual temperature range, and precipitation seasonality (i.e., the coefficient of variation of monthly precipitation) from WorldClim (Hijmans *et al.* 2005). All climatic predictor variables were converted to z-scores.

3. ANALYSES AND RESULTS

We combined canopy and litter samples and made three nested generalized linear models to predict S , using 1) climatic variables; 2) climate plus canopy/litter; and 3) climate, canopy/litter, and abundance. Climate contributed significantly (all but one climatic effect test was significant, see Table 1) and similarly (i.e., the confidence intervals of the parameter estimates overlapped, Table 1) to all three models. Temperature, precipitation and abundance were all positively correlated with species density in all 3 models, while temperature range and precipitation seasonality were either negatively correlated

with or were not significant predictors of ant species density (Table 1). Both of the more complex models performed better, based on AIC scores than the simpler models (Table 1). Model predictions of species density accounted for 52% of the variation in the combined observed data and 73% of the variation in canopy species density (Figure 1).

To investigate whether the effects of the predictor variables differed between canopy and litter samples, we created three (non-nested) generalized linear models separately, adding the interaction term for canopy/litter*temperature, canopy/litter*precipitation and canopy/litter*abundance. All three interaction terms were significant (Table 2) and the confidence intervals for most parameter estimates overlapped (excepting precipitation in the precipitation-interaction model, Table 2) with the “+Abundance” model (i.e., the best model without interaction terms). Of the six models presented here, the “best” model (i.e., the lowest AIC score) includes the effects of temperature, precipitation, precipitation seasonality, abundance and the abundance-canopy/litter interaction.

4. DISCUSSION

As would be expected (Kaspari, *et al.* 2004; Sanders, *et al.* 2007; Dunn, *et al.* 2009), ant species density was highest in warmer, wetter and relatively stable forests. More important to our goals, three details of the models presented here indicate that species density of canopy and litter ant share similar climatic drivers. First, when considering only climate and habitat, Canopy/Litter was a significant predictor of species density, but adding abundance to the model made Canopy/Litter non-significant. Thus, the apparent differences in species density between canopy and litter samples are probably due to differences in abundance-species density relationships, not differences in the relationships between climate and species density. Second, the climatic parameter estimates were generally consistent across models that incorporated climate, canopy/litter and abundance, as well as across models with the interactions of temperature, precipitation and abundance with canopy/litter. Lastly, the overall model

(i.e., the “+Abundance” model in Table 1), which was generated with disproportionately more litter assemblages, shows a better match between predicted and observed species density for the canopy assemblages ($r^2=0.73$, $n=23$, see Figure 1) than it does for the overall data set ($r^2=0.52$, $n=192$).

The interaction models indicate differences between canopy and litter species density, but these differences appear relatively minor. The addition of terms for the interactions of canopy/litter and temperature, precipitation and abundance all yielded models that were statistically better than the non-interaction models (based on AIC scores, see Table 2), but the addition of interaction terms did little to increase the match between predicted and observed species density (i.e., compare the r^2 observed ~ predicted in Tables 1 & 2). Our results suggest that these modest differences are a function of differences in the number of individuals sampled. Once abundance was included in the model, the effect of canopy/litter was not a significant predictor of species density. Thus, differences between canopy and litter are likely due to differences in how climate affects the abundance of canopy vs. litter ants and/or how collection methods sample a single abundance-diversity relationship shared by the canopy and litter habitats.

While we argue that the differences in the climate-species density relationships between canopy and ground ant are minor, the models which include interaction terms indicate that canopy species density may be more sensitive to the positive effects of temperature and precipitation (i.e., the interaction terms for both predicted higher species density for canopy samples). Additionally, the interaction of canopy/litter and abundance indicates that for a given abundance, canopy samples have fewer species than litter samples (underscoring the potential differences in abundance-species density relationships and supporting the suggestions of Davidson, *et al.* 2007).

While the forest canopy is of great interest to biologists, it remains difficult to study and relatively poorly known. Consequently, canopy biodiversity has played a relatively minor role in

understanding and conserving biodiversity. The tendency to date has been to emphasize the differences between canopy and forest floor faunas (e.g., Yanoviak and Kaspari 2000), but here we highlight their similarities. Both faunas increase in species density with increasing temperature, precipitation and climatic stability (Kaspari, *et al.* 2004; Sanders, *et al.* 2007; Dunn, *et al.* 2009) and the differences in their diversity for a given set of climatic conditions appear to be primarily due to differences in abundances (whether in abundances in samples or abundances per some area or volume). A key remaining question is how best to determine the relevant area or volume over which such abundances should best be considered. If, despite their differences in life history and diet, canopy and litter ants have similar species-abundance distributions, it would suggest broad generalities among ant assemblages regardless of whether the ants are walking overhead or underfoot.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. RRD, MDW and NJS were supported by a DOE-NICCR, DOE-PER DE-FG02-08ER64510 and a NASA Biodiversity Grant (ROSES-NNX09AK22G). TPM, JTL, AVS and BLF by the National Science Foundation (TPM by NSF-OISE-0749047; JTL by NSF-DEB-0640015, Project LLAMA; AVS by NSF-0716966 and BLF by NSF-DEB0842395).

157 LITERATURE CITED

- 158 Blüthgen N, G. Gebauer & K. Fiedler. 2003. Disentangling a rainforest food web using stable isotopes:
159 dietary diversity in a species-rich ant community. *Oecologia* **137**: 426-435
- 160 Brühl, C.A., G. Gunsalem, M. & K.E. Linsenmair. 1998. Stratification of ants (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) in
161 a primary rain forest in Sabah, Borneo. *J. Trop. Ecol.* **14**:285-297.
- 162 Brühl, C.A., M. Mohamed & K.E. Linsenmair. 1999. Altitudinal distribution of leaf litter ants along a
163 transect in primary forest on Mount Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia. *J. Trop. Ecol.* **15**:265–267.
- 164 Currie, D. J., *et al.* 2004. Predictions and tests of climate-based hypotheses of broad-scale variation in
165 taxonomic richness. *Ecol. Lett.* **7**:1121-1134.
- 166 Davidson, D.W., J. -P. Lessard, B.C.R. Bernau & S.C. Cook. 2007. The tropical ant mosaic in a primary
167 Bornean rain forest. *Biotropica* **39**:468-475.
- 168 Davidson, D.W., S.C. Cook, R.R. Snelling & T.H. Chua. 2003. Explaining the abundance of ants in lowland
169 tropical rainforest canopies. *Science* **300**(5621):969-972.
- 170 Davidson, D.W. & L. Patrell-Kim. 1996. Tropical arboreal ants: Why so abundant? In *Neotropical*
171 *Biodiversity and Conservation*. (ed. A.C. Gibson) pp. 127-140. University of California, Los Angeles.
- 172 Dunn, R.R., *et al.* 2009 Climatic drivers of hemispheric asymmetry in global patterns of ant species
173 richness. *Ecol. Lett.* **12**:324-333.
- 174 Erwin, T. L. 1982. Tropical forests: their richness in Coleoptera and other species. *Coleopterist's Bull.*
175 **36**:74–75.
- 176 Fittkau E. J. & Klinge H. (1973) On biomass and trophic structure of the Central Amazonian rain forest
177 ecosystem. *Biotropica* **5**:2-14.
- 178 Floren A. & K.E. Linsenmair. 1997. Diversity and recolonization dynamics of selected arthropod groups
179 on different tree species in a lowland rainforest in Sabah, Malaysia with special reference to Formicidae.
180 In *Canopy Arthropods*. (eds. Stork NE, J. Adis & R.K. Didham) pp. 344-381. New York, Chapman and Hall.
- 181 Gaston K.J. 2000. Global patterns in biodiversity. *Nature*, 405, 220-227.
- 182 Gotelli, N.J. and R.K. Colwell. 2001. Quantifying biodiversity: procedures and pitfalls in the measurement
183 and comparison of species richness. *Ecology Letters* **4**: 379-391
- 184 Hawkins B.A., *et al.* 2003. Energy, water, and broad-scale geographic patterns of species richness.
185 *Ecology*, **84**, 3105-3117.
- 186 Hijmans, R.J., S.E. Cameron, J.L. Parra, P.G. Jones & A. Jarvis, 2005. Very high resolution interpolated
187 climate surfaces for global land areas. *Int. J. Clim.* **25**:1965-1978.

188 Hood, W.G and W.R. Tschinkel. 1990. Desiccation resistance in arboreal and terrestrial ants.
189 *Physiological Ecology*. 15(1):23-35.

190 Kaspari M., S. O'Donnell & J.R. Kercher. 2000. Energy, density, and constraints to species richness:
191 studies of ant assemblages along a productivity gradient. *Am. Nat.* **155**:280-293

192 Kaspari M., P.S. Ward & M. Yuan. 2004. Energy gradients and the geographic distribution of local ant
193 diversity. *Oecologia* **140**:407-414.

194 Kitching, R.L., J.M. Bergelson, M.D. Lowman, S. McIntyre & G. Carruthers. 1993. The biodiversity of
195 arthropods from Australian rainforest canopies: general introduction, methods, sites and ordinal results.
196 *Aust. J. Ecol.* **18**:181-191.

197 Longino, J.T. & R.K. Colwell. 1997. Biodiversity assessment using structured inventory: Capturing the ant
198 fauna of a tropical rain forest. *Ecol. App.* **7**:1263-1277.

199 Majer, J.D., R.L. Kitching, B.E. Heterick, K. Hurley & K.E.C. Brennan. 2001. North-South patterns within
200 arboreal ant assemblages from rain forests in Eastern Australia. *Biotropica* **33**:643-661.

201 Novotny, V., Y. Basset, S.E. Miller, G.D. Weiblen, B. Bremerk, L. Cizek and & P. Drozd. 2002. Low host
202 specificity of herbivorous insects in a tropical forest. *Nature* **416**:841-844.

203 Ødegaard, F. 2000. How many species of arthropods? Erwin's estimate revised. *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* **71**:583–
204 597.

205 Sanders NJ, Lessard J-P, Dunn RR, Fitzpatrick MC (2007) Temperature, but not productivity or geometry,
206 predicts elevational diversity gradients in ants across spatial grains. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*
207 **16**:640-649.

208 Schuur, E.A.G. 2003. Productivity and global climate revisited: The sensitivity of tropical forest growth to
209 precipitation. *Ecology* **84**:1165-1170.

210 Stork, N.E. 1993. How many species are there? *Biodiversity and Conservation* **2**:215–232.

211 Tobin, J.E. 1995. Ecology and Diversity of Tropical Forest Canopy Ants. In *Forest Canopies*, (eds. M.D.
212 Lowman & N.M. Nadkarni). pp.129-147. New York, Academic Press.

213 Ward, P.S. 2000. Broad-scale patterns of diversity in leaf-litter ant communities. In *Ants: Standard*
214 *Methods for Measuring and Monitoring Biodiversity* (eds. D. Agosti, J.D. Majer, L.A. Alonso). pp. 99-121.
215 Washington, DC, Smithsonian.

216 Yanoviak, S.P. and M. Kaspari. 2000. Community structure and the habitat templet: ants in the tropical
217 forest canopy and litter. *Oikos* **89**:259-266.

218 Table One: Three nested Generalized Linear Models of species density with all samples combined. The first model ("Climate") includes the
 219 climatic parameters. "+ Canopy/Litter" adds the classification variable (whether the samples are from the Canopy or Litter). "+Abundance" adds
 220 abundance (*N*) as a measure of sampling effort. All climatic variables have been converted to z-scores. The two more complex models are
 221 significant given AIC minimization. Note that the effect of canopy/litter is significant, unless the number of individuals is included. Parameter
 222 estimates and AIC values do not include non-significant terms. **p<0.0001, *p<0.01, ns=not significant at p=0.05
 223
 224

	Climate			Canopy/Litter			Abundance		
	Estimates	84%CI		Estimates	84%CI		Estimates	84%CI	
Intercept	3.075**	3.050	3.100	3.056**	3.029	3.082	3.063**	3.039	3.088
Mean Annual Temperature	0.514**	0.468	0.561	0.513**	0.466	0.556	0.565**	0.535	0.595
Annual Precipitation	0.208**	0.182	0.234	0.217**	0.192	0.243	0.246**	0.224	0.268
Temperature Range	-0.130**	-0.181	-0.079	-0.105**	-0.157	-0.054	ns	ns	ns
Precipitation Seasonality	-0.115**	-0.141	-0.089	-0.096**	-0.123	-0.070	-0.095**	-0.120	-0.070
Canopy/Litter [Canopy]	-----			0.169*	0.115	0.222	ns	ns	ns
Number of Individuals	-----			-----			0.135**	0.125	0.144
AIC	-28,259			-28,278			-28,528		
r ² observed ~ predicted	0.452			0.465			0.522		

225
 226 Table Two: Three (non-nested) Generalized Linear Models of species density with all samples combined. All three models include climatic
 227 variables, canopy/litter, abundance and the interaction of Canopy/Litter and Temperature, Precipitation and Abundance respectively. The effect
 228 sizes for the interaction terms are for Canopy samples (with Litter samples being that value*-1). Thus the effects of Mean Annual Temperature,
 229 Annual Precipitation, and Abundance differ between Canopy and Litter samples. Parameter estimates and AIC values do not include non-
 230 significant terms (i.e., for the abundance model). **p<0.0001, *p<0.01, ns=not significant at p=0.05

Interaction of Canopy/Litter and:

	Temperature			Precipitation			Abundance		
	Estimates	84%CI		Estimates	84%CI		Estimates	84%CI	
Intercept	3.088**	3.062	3.115	3.084**	3.058	3.109	3.076**	3.034	3.118
Mean Annual Temperature	0.489**	0.441	0.537	0.512**	0.467	0.558	0.556**	0.504	0.607
Annual Precipitation	0.209**	0.182	0.236	0.193**	0.165	0.221	0.243**	0.205	0.281
Temperature Range	-0.084*	-0.136	-0.031	-0.088*	-0.138	-0.037	ns	ns	ns
Precipitation Seasonality	-0.106**	-0.133	-0.079	-0.110**	-0.136	-0.084	-0.094**	-0.137	-0.051
Canopy/Litter [Canopy]	-1.514**	-1.894	-1.133	-0.283**	-0.283	-0.133	ns	ns	ns
Number of Individuals	0.140**	0.126	0.149	0.143**	0.132	0.154	0.361**	0.316	0.407
Interaction of Canopy/Litter and focal variable	0.006**	0.006	0.008	0.148**	0.104	0.191	-0.251**	-0.299	-0.203
AIC	-28,565			-28,549			-28,657		
r² observed ~ predicted	0.526			0.521			0.539		

231 FIGURE LEGENDS

232 Figure 1. Ant species density predicted by our model (i.e., the “+Abundance” model in Table 1)
233 compared to observed ant species density. Open circles represent litter samples, closed circles
234 represent canopy fogging samples. Both panels present the same information, with the bottom panel
235 scaled with \log_{10} -transformed axes (to allow visualization). The line represents the ordinary least squares
236 regression on the combined data set with $\text{observed} = 1.1 + (0.96 * \text{predicted})$, $p < 0.0001$, $r^2 = 0.52$, $n = 192$.
237 The relationship for the canopy data is $\text{observed} = 1.8 + (0.93 * \text{predicted})$, $p < 0.0001$, $r^2 = 0.73$, $n = 23$.

